

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 17, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 47, 51-53 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being unpatentable over Berger. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 52 has been placed in independent form and recites, *inter alia*, "further comprising logic configured to transfer a session to a second outside entity; wherein the second outside entity is a public safety answering point." Berger fails to teach this feature. In the analysis of claim 52, the Examiner cites to agent 14 as being the second outside entity. The Examiner, however, has already relied on the agent 14 as corresponding to the first outside entity. It is not clear how the agent 14 in Berger can correspond to two different outside entities. Thus, Berger fails to teach transferring a session to a second outside entity.

Further, Berger fails to teach that the second outside entity is a public safety answering point. A public safety answering point, as used in Applicants' specification and in the art, is an entity that dispatches emergency response professionals (page 1, lines 8-15 of Applicants' specification). This definition is consistent with definitions in the art. Berger fails to teach a public safety answering point. The agent 14 in Berger is an educational resource, not a public safety answering point. Thus, Berger cannot anticipate claim 52.

For at least the above reasons, claim 52 is patentable over Berger. It is noted that claim 52 has been placed in independent form with no substantive amendments. Accordingly, any new grounds of rejection must be non-final as Applicants' amendments have not raised new issues that would necessitate a new grounds of rejection.

Independent claim 53 recites features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 52 and is patentable over Berger for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 52. Claim 55 depends from claim 53 and is patentable over Berger for at least the same reasons.

Claims 48-50 and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Berger in view of Gaos. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Gaos was relied upon for disclosing secure communications and digital certificates, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Berger discussed above with reference to claim 52. Claims 48-50 depend from claim 52 and are patentable over Berger in view of Gaos for at least the reasons advance with reference to claim 52. Claim 54 depends upon claim 53, and is patentable over Berger in view of Gaos for at least the reasons advance with reference to claim 53.

Claims 56-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Berger in view of Kite. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Kite was relied upon for disclosing monitoring a location that is a moving object, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Berger discussed above with reference to claim 53. Claims 56-58 depend from claim 53 and are patentable over Berger in view of Kite for at least the reasons advance with reference to claim 53.

Claims 59-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Kite in view of Gaos. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 59 recites, *inter alia*, “an wireless interface to a sensing element to monitor a location.” Kite fails to teach this feature. The Examiner relies on Figures 19A-19F of Kite which show various embodiments of a networked answering machine that interfaces with other devices. Kite fails to teach a sensing element to monitor a location. In fact, Kite makes no mention of a sensor or sensing element at all. Thus, Kite cannot be relied upon for disclosing a sensing element. Gaos was relied upon for disclosing secure communications, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Kite. Thus, even if Kite and Gaos are combined, the features of claim 59 do not result.

For at least the above reasons, claim 59 is patentable over Kite in view of Gaos. Claims 60-62 depend from claim 59 and are patentable over Kite in view of Gaos for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 59.

For at least the reasons advanced above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested. The Examiner is cordially requested to telephone, if the Examiner believes that it would be advantageous to the disposition of this case.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment, which may be required for this amendment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in any petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox

Registration No. 38,807

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone (860) 286-2929

Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Customer No. 36192

Date: October 16, 2007